



**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**  
*The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia*

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP**

**Monday, August 18, 2014, 10:00am**  
**Fairfax Department of Transportation**  
**4050 Legato Road, Suite 400**  
**Fairfax, Virginia 22033**

**AGENDA**

**I. Call to Order/Welcome** **Chairman Nohe**

**II. Meeting Summary of July 11, 2014, Meeting**  
*Recommended action: Approval [with abstentions  
from those who were not present].*

**Discussion/Information**

**III. NVTA Update** **Ms. Backmon**

**IV. Financial Committee Report** **Mr. Longhi**

**V. Discussion of NVTA Two Year Program** **Mr. Jasper**  
*A. Draft Project Selection Criteria*

1. Suggested criteria and rating system
2. Suggested weightings
3. Modal balance
4. Continuity of project funding
5. Project funding requests vs. revenues
6. Cost sharing
7. Geographic balance
8. Other

**VI. Other Business**

**VII. Next Meeting**

**Adjournment**

**VIII. Adjourn**

**NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY****Project Implementation Working Group****July 11, 2014 at 10am****Fairfax Department of Transportation Office – 4050 Legato Road (Suite 400)****SUMMARY NOTES****I. Introductions**

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 10:05am. The meeting began with participant self-introductions.
- Attendees:
  - ✓ PIWG Members: Chairman Nohe, Vice Chair Garczynski, Marti Reinfeld (City of Alexandria); Larry Marcus, Sarah Crawford, Jason Friess (Arlington County); Tom Biesiadny, Karyn Moreland, Ray Johnson, Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Paul Stoddard (City of Falls Church); Bob Brown (Loudoun County); Patrick Moore (City of Manassas); Rick Canizales (Prince William County); Allison Davis (WMATA); Jillian Linnell (NVTC); Cynthia Porter-Johnson (PRTC); Rich Roisman (TPB); Helen Cuervo; Renee Hamilton; Kanti Srikanth; Valerie Pardo, Maria Sinner (VDOT); Joe Swartz (VRE).
  - ✓ NVRTA Members: Board Member Hynes (Arlington County); Chairman York (Loudoun County); Council Member Rishell (City of Manassas Park); Mayor Parrish (City of Manassas); Miss Bushue (Governor's Appointee); Delegate Rust (Virginia House of Delegates).
  - ✓ NVRTA Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Mike Longhi (CFO); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Denise Harris (Program Coordinator); Peggy Teal (Accountant).
  - ✓ Other Staff: Richard West (Town of Dumfries); Mark Duceman (Town of Herndon); Mark Thomas; Cam Plunkett (Chairman's Office, Fairfax County).
  - ✓ Other: Dalia Leven (AECOM); Rob Whitfield (Dulles Corridor Users Group).

**II. Approval of Summary of March 21, 2014 Meeting**

- Chairman York moved to approve the minutes of March 21, 2014; seconded by Mr. West. Motion carried unanimously.

**III. Reports from Financial Committee/Working Group**

- Mr. Longhi reported that all member jurisdictions are now receiving '30 percent' funds from NVRTA. He also reported that the Authority's line of credit facility was in place.

#### IV. Report and Discussion on VDOT Basic Evaluation and Rating of Regional Projects

- Mr. Srikanth presented the preliminary findings of the HB 599 study. Page numbers below refer to Mr. Srikanth's presentation dated July 11, 2014, entitled *Evaluation and Rating of Significant Transportation Projects in NoVA*.

##### Page #2

- ✓ The findings are high level and are intended for use by NVTA as a first set of ratings to support its programming needs.
- ✓ The regional travel demand model used for the basic ratings is good for assessing the impact of segments and corridors, but a modified version of this model was developed to evaluate the operational impacts of some types of project.
- ✓ It will not be necessary for future HB 599 studies to include two sets of ratings. However the analysis needed to generate these initial, or basic, ratings will continue to be required for the final ratings in future HB 599 studies.

##### Page #3

- ✓ Six intersection improvement/Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects necessitated the development of a modified travel demand model. The detailed analysis that will form the basis for the final ratings uses a different model that is better suited for all 37 projects being rated.

##### Page #4

- ✓ Five performance measures were used to evaluate each project, weighted equally. Three measures addressed the roadway being improved and two measures looked at the area experiencing the greatest impact as a result of the project.
- ✓ The study's peer review group recommended the third roadway performance measure (person miles of travel per capacity increase) to ensure that smaller projects were not at an inherent disadvantage due to their size.

##### Page #6

- ✓ Mr. Srikanth explained that the area of greatest impact for each project was selected to ensure that the modelling tools did not disadvantage any projects. The detailed results later this year will be less affected by such issues.
- ✓ In response to a question from Council Member Rishell, Mr. Srikanth confirmed that project impact reduces with distance from the project facility.
- ✓ Board Member Hynes asked about the definition of 'Person Miles of Travel'. Mr. Srikanth confirmed that while the person miles of travel measures included all modes, none of the projects are for transit improvements. In response to a

question from Delegate Rust, Mr. Srikanth confirmed that the modeling tools included factors to reflect the level of single-occupant vehicles (SOV).

#### Page #9

- ✓ Mr. Srikanth noted that projects marked with a '\*' were on new alignments. The analysis of these projects considered existing adjacent facilities that would be replaced.
- ✓ Chairman Nohe asked why Project #11 (US-1 Widening, Dumfries) was rated 'high' in 2020 and 'low' in 2040, and why there are apparent inconsistencies in the ratings of adjacent projects along the same route, e.g. US-1.
- ✓ Mr. Srikanth explained that the 2020 ratings may differ from the 2040 ratings for a number of reasons, including changes in demographic and employment patterns, and the scheduling of project improvements. He noted, however, that just because a project is included in the CLRP does not guarantee when it will be constructed, if at all. The detailed ratings will incorporate some 'clean up' related to incorrect CLRP data. In general, projects in the outer jurisdictions did better in 2040.
- ✓ Mr. Garczynski suggested that modeling anomalies need to be identified (or fixed) before NVTA makes any investment decisions. Chairman York suggested that the jurisdiction proposing each project be identified.
- ✓ Board Member Hynes requested an explanation of the difference between these preliminary findings and the detailed findings expected in December. Mr. Srikanth explained that it was unusual for two different modeling processes to be used to evaluate the same projects. It was difficult to know what the differences will be between the basic and detailed ratings. Typically, regional models do not address congestion on adjacent links, and focus more on links rather than intersections. The detailed model that VDOT will be using will reflect real world conditions better than the regional model used for the basic ratings. Another difference is that the detailed ratings will use a different set of measures compared to the basic ratings. Overall, Mr. Srikanth expected a broadly similar pattern of results, with lower rated projects performing slightly better in the detailed ratings.
- ✓ At the conclusion of the rating study, the new TRANSIMS model will be available to NVTA and other jurisdictions for detailed regional modeling, including signal timing/phasing.

#### Page #10

- ✓ Mr. Srikanth stated that project maps would be available after July 24. Board Member Hynes asked whether the maps should be enhanced to include details of the other relevant/nearby projects that have been included. It was concluded this would be difficult for HB 599, but should be addressed during the update of TransAction 2040.

- ✓ Delegate Rust asked whether VDOT has taken into account which projects jurisdictions have implemented. Mr. Srikanth stated these are included in the base case, but any improvements currently in process may affect this.
  - ✓ Chairman Nohe asked to what extent the findings reflect regional significance. Mr. Srikanth suggested the detailed ratings will reflect regional significance more than the basic ratings.
  - ✓ Chairman York asked about the interaction between project #8 (Belmont Ridge Road) and project #22 (Northstar Boulevard). Mr. Srikanth suggested they discuss the details after the meeting.
- Chairman Nohe suggested that there be less technical detail in the report to the Authority on July 24.

## **V. Discussion of NVT A Six Year Program**

### **A. Coordination with VDOT Evaluation and Rating Study**

Mr. Srikanth stated VDOT's analysis will be complete by the end of October 2014, noting the draft will be available in November and final HB 599 ratings will be published by the end of December 2014. Mr. Garczynski indicated that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) would likely handle the HB 599 ratings as a consensus item, rather than an action item. Mr. Srikanth added that there should be less focus on the methodology for the final ratings, as this has already been discussed and agreed between VDOT and NVT A.

The next HB 599 cycle is scheduled for next year. When started, VDOT estimates that the second round of HB 599 analysis should take 6 to 8 months to complete. PIWG discussed the feasibility of having a call for projects in December 2014, although no firm decision was made. VDOT indicated that after the next cycle, the intent is to repeat HB 599 every four years. Concerns were expressed that this may lead to some inflexibility for updating the Six Year Program.

Uncertainties associated with the implementation of HB2 were noted, particularly with respect to proposed projects that will use co-mingled state and local funds. Chairman Nohe stated it that it is important to know which projects rely on state funding. Board Member Hynes agreed that Authority members should be aware of this, and noted that the HB 599 ratings are one of several factors to be taken into account for making funding decisions.

Mr. Garczynski added that the CTB will be initiating a task force to address the implementation of HB 2. In Northern Virginia, the focus of HB 2 is expected to favor projects that provide congestion relief, using a simplified process. Chairman York stated that HB 2 must be implemented starting in FY2017.

Delegate Rust asked how HB 2 will address congestion relief in other parts of the state. Mr. Garczynski stated this has yet to be decided, but is likely to be less

rigorous than the HB 599 approach used in Northern Virginia. It was noted that the update of the TransAction 2040 should consider HB 2 and HB 599 as the process develops. Mr. Brown (Loudoun County) suggested that NVTA could conduct the HB 599 process using VDOT's model.

**B. Timeline and Steps for NVTA Six Year Program Strawman**

Mr. Canizales presented a draft schedule for the FY2015-16 Two Year Program, with NVTA approval planned in April/May 2015. Project selection criteria may need to be reviewed to reflect different priorities compared to the FY2014 project selection process. The draft schedule assumes coordination with the JACC, TAC, and PCAC in October, although this could occur in September if the schedule needs to be accelerated. Depending on how public involvement is addressed, it may be possible to accelerate the schedule from late spring to early spring.

**VI. Other Business**

- None

**VII. Next Meeting**

- 10:00 am, Monday August 18, 2014 at FCDOT offices, Legato Road.

**VIII. Adjournment**

- Meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.



**NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
Project Implementation Working Group**

**Two Year Program  
Draft Project Selection Criteria  
(August 18, 2014)**

**I. Background**

- In December 2013, NVTA issued a call for projects for the first 2.5 years of its Six Year Program, now referred to as the Two Year Program.<sup>1</sup> The Two Year Program will contain the regional projects that will be funded by NVTA's regional (70%) funds. The Two Year Program does not include projects funded by member jurisdictions using NVTA's local (30%) funds.
- A total of 52 regional projects were nominated for funding consideration:
  - 33 highway projects (see Attachment A)
  - 19 mass transit projects (see Attachment B)
  - Includes 6/15 'Carryover' projects from FY2014
  - Four counties, three cities, four towns, and three transit agencies responded.
- In February 2014, VDOT issued a call for projects for the HB599 Project Evaluation and Rating Study.
- At its February 18, 2014 meeting, the PIWG agreed to recommend all 33 highway projects to the Authority for nomination to VDOT for the rating study. Two of these highway projects were submitted as a single project package.
- The 19 mass transit projects were not required to be included in the rating study but remain under active consideration for inclusion in the Authority's Two Year Program, along with the highway projects.
- At its meeting on July 24, 2014, the Authority approved a schedule to develop and adopt the Two Year Program (see Attachment C.) This schedule is an accelerated version of the schedule presented to the PIWG at its last meeting on July 11, 2014.
- NVTA estimates that approximately \$365,000,000 will be available from regional revenues thru FY2016 to fund regional projects, assuming PayGo funding only (see Attachment D.)
- Funding requests thru FY2016 associated with 52 highway and mass transit projects:

○ Highway projects	\$423,452,810
○ Mass Transit projects	<u>\$346,166,000</u>
○ Total	\$769,618,810
- It is noted that some of the projects that are under consideration for inclusion in the Two Year Program were approved for funding in FY2014. These projects are listed below, together with their FY2014 funding allocations, and the corresponding funding request for FY2015/16 funds in parentheses:

---

<sup>1</sup> Covers FY2015/16 funding – FY2014 was included in the match reserve for the Line of Credit

○ Route 1 Widening (Prince William County)	\$ 3,000,000 (\$ 49,400,000)
○ Innovation Metrorail Station (Fairfax County)	\$41,000,000 (\$ 48,000,000)
○ Traction Power Upgrades (WMATA)	\$ 5,000,000 (\$ 44,416,000)
○ Transit Buses <sup>2</sup> (WMATA)	\$ 7,000,000 (\$ 12,400,000)
○ Columbia Pike Improvements (Arlington Co.)	\$12,000,000 (\$ 10,000,000)
○ Transit Buses (Loudoun County)	\$ 880,000 (\$ 1,860,000)
○ Potomac Yard Metrorail Station (Alexandria)	\$ 2,000,000 (\$ 1,500,000)
○ Route 15/Edwards Ferry (Leesburg):	\$ 1,000,000 (\$ 1,000,000)
○ Transit Signal Priority (Alexandria)	\$ 660,000 (\$ 190,000)
○ Total	<b>\$72,540,000 (\$168,766,000)</b>

## II. Purpose of today's meeting

- Consistent with the approved schedule, the purpose of today's meeting is for the PIWG to commence development of project selection criteria to be applied to the 52 projects that have requested NVTA FY15-16 regional funds.
- **Specific actions and considerations for PIWG are highlighted in bold text below.**
- To maintain schedule, the project selection criteria must be approved by the Authority at its meeting on October 9, 2014. Prior to this, the draft project selection criteria must be reviewed by the TAC (September 17), PCAC (September 22), JACC (September 25), and the Council of Counsels.
- NVTA staff are working with jurisdictional and agency staff to review previously submitted information for candidate projects. This is to ensure that NVTA maintains a project database that is up to date, comprehensive, and accurate. This in turn will allow the project selection criteria to be applied on a consistent basis.
- Project funding mechanism (PayGo or bond financing) is not considered to be a criterion for project selection. Optimal arrangements for funding projects will be determined after the projects to be included in the Two Year Program have been selected.
- Similarly, detailed decisions related to the programming of funding will be determined after the projects to be included in the Two Year Program have been selected, taking account of factors such as cash flow analysis.

## III. Overall approach to project selection

- Similar to the methodology used for selecting regional projects that were funded with FY2014 funds, the overall approach for this current round of project selection will use three screening tiers. Some minor differences are proposed to the application of these screening tiers, reflecting the unique circumstances of this current round of project selection.
  - Tier I: this is a pass/fail filter. Each project must pass all applicable criteria to be considered for funding. In addition to previously used pass/fail criteria, highway projects must be rated in the HB599 Project Evaluation and Rating Study.

---

<sup>2</sup> FY2015/16 funding request includes transit buses and infrastructure improvements



- Tier II: projects that pass Tier I are scored against each selection criterion, with each criterion being weighted. A composite score is calculated for each project. Selection criteria are based on a combination of criteria from the TransAction 2040 long range transportation plan; the FY2014 project selection methodology, and the rating study.
- Tier III: projects are assessed using qualitative factors and considerations that do not lend themselves to the quantitative scoring approach used in Tier II. It is envisioned that the Tier II and Tier III screenings will be used in parallel.

#### **IV. Tier I results**

- Five pass/fail criteria are considered in the Tier I screening filter. Three criteria apply to all projects, and two criteria apply to either highway or mass transit projects as appropriate. Projects can only be funded with NVTA regional funds if they pass all applicable criteria:

##### All projects

- Contained in the TransAction 2040 long range transportation plan;<sup>3</sup>
- Reduce congestion; and
- Within a locality embraced by the Authority or in adjacent localities but only to the extent that such extension is an insubstantial part of the project and is essential to the viability of the project within the localities embraced by the Authority.

##### Highway projects

- Rated in the HB599 Project Evaluation and Rating Study (does not apply to projects funded using NVTA FY2014 regional funds.)<sup>4</sup> All highway projects in Attachment A are subject to the current rating study. Basic (interim) ratings were presented to the PIWG at its July 11, 2014 meeting, and to the Authority at its July 24, 2014 meeting. However, project selection criteria will be applied to the final ratings, which will be available by December 31, 2014 (with draft final ratings in November 2014.)

##### Mass Transit projects

- Increase capacity.
- Four highway projects and one mass transit project are not contained in the TransAction 2040 long range transportation plan and are therefore excluded from further consideration. These projects are highlighted in yellow in Attachments A and B, and account for \$50.4 Million in project funding requests.

#### **V. Tier II – Specific PIWG actions requested**

---

<sup>3</sup> Or included in the 2010 Constrained Long Range Plan/Transportation Improvement Program

<sup>4</sup> In addition to the NVTA projects nominated for the rating study, five projects nominated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) were also rated. None of these CTB-nominated projects fully complies with Tier I.

- In the Tier II screening, a composite score will be calculated for each of the projects based on its overall performance against all of the project selection criteria. The composite score will be calculated using a three-step approach:
  - In step one, the performance of each project will be scored against each selection criterion. The better a project performs against a criterion, the higher the score it will receive.  
**PIWG action #1: review each criterion and its associated rating system.**
  - In step two, weights will be applied to each criterion reflecting their relative importance.  
**PIWG action #2: review the relative weights.**
  - In step three, the criterion weights are applied to corresponding criterion scores, and the weighted scores are summed to calculate each project's composite score.
- NVTa staff have developed draft project selection criteria for Tier II, and a scoring system for each (see Attachment E.) The draft project selection criteria place the greatest emphasis on congestion relief and project readiness.
- For highway projects, the detailed final ratings from the HB599 Project Evaluation and Rating Study will be used as the congestion relief criterion. The current rating study will not provide ratings for mass transit projects. While it is likely that future rating studies will include an evaluation of mass transit projects, two options are suggested for selection of mass transit projects for the Two Year Program:
  - For mass transit projects, use a congestion relief criterion that is consistent with that used in the TransAction 2040 long range transportation plan, as an alternative to the HB599 rating that will be used for highway projects. Congestion impact of mass transit projects will be rated qualitatively. Under this option, highway and mass transit projects can be compared on a broadly consistent basis.
  - Pre-determine the respective proportion of the available funds for highway and mass transit projects. Under this option, highway projects would only be compared with other highway projects. Similarly, mass transit projects would only be compared with other mass transit projects.  
**PIWG action #3: consider the approach for achieving modal balance in the project selection process.**
- For reference, NVTa's regional (70%) funds for FY2014, including both PayGo and bond financing projects, were allocated as follows:
  - Highway projects                   \$117,835,000 (60%)
  - Mass Transit projects           \$ 78,158,000 (40%)

## VI. Tier III – Additional Considerations for PIWG

- As noted above, some projects that were funded using FY2014 funds have requested additional FY2015/16 funds amounting to \$168,766,000. This is approximately half of the estimated available funds.

**PIWG action #4: guidance is requested regarding the extent to which continuity of funding is a factor in the current project selection process.**

- Given the scale of the funding requests relative to available FY2015/16 funds, consideration may be appropriate for the following options:
  - Setting a limit on the maximum funds available per selected project; and
  - Awarding only a portion of the requested funds to the projects selected for funding.
- Such an approach would require jurisdictions and agencies to make up any shortfall. This in turn may result in projects being delayed or cancelled should alternative funding sources be unavailable.

**PIWG action #5: guidance is requested on options for limiting funding awards.**

- While cost sharing is a Tier II criterion, additional consideration may be necessary in the Tier III screening with respect to the potential for project delays arising from any conditions associated with, or uncertainty in the commitment of, non-NVTA funds.

**PIWG action #6: guidance is requested on addressing issues related to cost sharing.**

- Consideration must be given to achieving a geographic balance in the selection of projects, taking into account the geographic distribution of projects selected for FY2014 funding.

**PIWG action #7: guidance is requested on options for addressing geographic balance.**

- As part of its efforts to review previously submitted information for candidate projects, NVTA staff have asked jurisdictions and agencies to provide any additional information that may support the project selection process. Responses are still being processed, but it is envisioned that this additional information will not lend itself to be included in the Tier II screening. Consequently, any such information may be considered in the Tier III screening.

**PIWG action #8: guidance is requested on how to take account of additional supporting information.**

### Attachments:

- A. Highway Projects Submitted for Consideration for FY2014 – FY2016 Funding
- B. Mass Transit Projects Submitted for Consideration for FY2014 – FY2016 Funding
- C. Two Year Program Development Schedule (Approved July 24, 2014)
- D. Estimate of Available Funds thru FY2016
- E. Draft Project Selection Criteria

**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA)**

**Projects Submitted for Consideration for FY 2014 - FY2016 Funding (02/18/13 -V.3) - Projects Recommended for VDOT Evaluation and Rating Study**

ALL PROJECTS (Except Mass Transit Projects that Increase Capacity)													Tier I Screen		
Item	Agency	Project Description	FY14 Funding Required	FY15 Funding Required	FY16 Funding Required	Total Project Cost	Corridor	Route	Status	CLRP/TIP	TA 2040	RC	Mass Transit Capacity	Within/adj. to NVTA Boundary	Meets All Requirements (Y/N)
1	Arlington	Route 244 Columbia Pike Street Improvements (S. Gate Road to the Pentagon)	0	10,000,000	0	80,000,000	9	244	Design	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2	Fairfax	Rolling Road Widening from Old Keene Mill Road to Franconia Springfield Pkwy	0	13,850,000	13,850,000	35,200,000	5	638	Design	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
3	Fairfax	US 29 Lee Highway (from west of Union Mill Road to Buckley's Gate Drive)	0	5,000,000	5,000,000	41,000,000	6	29	Study	Y	N	N	N/A	Y	Y
4	Fairfax	Braddock Road HOV Widening	0	5,000,000	5,000,000	63,000,000	7	620	Study	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
5	Fairfax	South Van Dorn Street and Franconia Road Interchange	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	139,500,000	7	613/644	Study	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
6	Fairfax	Frontier Drive Extension & Braided Ramps	0	5,000,000	4,450,000	84,500,000	N/A	2677	Study	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	Y
7	Fairfax	Fairfax County Parkway Improvements (Study)	0	10,000,000	10,000,000	396,100,000	N/A	286	Study	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
8	Loudoun	Belmont Ridge Road (VA Route 659)- Turo Parish Road to Croson Ln	0	19,500,000	0	36,225,000	2	659	Final Design	Y	Y	N	N/A	Y	Y
9	Loudoun	Loudoun County Parkway (VA Route 607) – U.S. 50 to Creighton Rd.	0	7,000,000	24,000,000	51,000,000	2	607	ROW	Y/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
10	Fairfax	Route 7 Widening – Dulles Toll Road Bridge	0	6,950,000	6,950,000	34,400,000	1	7	Final Design	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	Y
11	Dumfries	Widen Route 1 (Fraleay Boulevard) Brady's Hill Road to Route 234 (Dumfries Road)	0	3,500,000	3,400,000	82,500,000	8	1	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
12	Fairfax	US 1 Richmond Highway (from Mt. Vernon Memorial Highway to Napper Road)	0	6,750,000	6,750,000	90,000,000	8	1	Study	Y	N	N	N/A	Y	Y
13	Leesburg	Route 15 Bypass at Edwards Ferry Road Interchange	0	0	1,000,000	50,000,000	1	15	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
14	City of Fairfax	Northfax - Intersection and drainage improvements at Route 29/50 and Route 123	0	0	10,000,000	25,000,000		29/50/123	ROW	Y/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
15	City of Fairfax	Jermantown / Route 50 Roadway Improvements	0	1,000,000	0	6,500,000		50	ROW	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
16	Fairfax	Frying Pan Road (VA 28 to Centreville Road)	0	3,075,000	3,075,000	41,000,000	3	28	Study	Y	N	N	N/A	Y	Y
17	City of Fairfax	Kamp Washington Intersection Improvements	0	1,000,000	0	9,800,000		50/29/236	ROW	N/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
18	Alexandria	Real-Time Adaptive Traffic Control and Data Management System	0	500,000	0	16,500,000	8	N/A	Study	N	Check	Y	N/A	Y	Y
19	Arlington	Glebe Road Corridor Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Improvements	0	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	9	120	Study	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
20	Fairfax	Pohick Rd - US 1 (Richmond Hwy) to I-95 - 2 to 4 Lanes	0	2,500,000	2,500,000	29,250,000	8	638	Study	N	N	Y	N/A	Y	N
21	Fairfax	Shirley Gate Rd. from Braddock Rd. to Fairfax County Parkway/Popes Head Rd.	0	3,000,000	3,000,000	39,500,000	N/A	665	Study	N	N	Y	N/A	Y	N
22	Loudoun	Northstar Blvd. (VA Rte. 659 Reloc) – U.S. 50 to Evergreen Mills Rd. (VA Rte. 621)	0	0	9,400,000	13,800,000	2	259	Final Design	N	N	N	N/A	Y	N
23	Loudoun	Route 7 / 690 Interchange	0	0	6,000,000	36,687,000	1	7/690	PE	N	N	N	N/A	Y	N
24	Manassas	Route 234 Grant Avenue Study	235,000	0	0	235,000	2	234	Study	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
25	Purcellville	Main Street and Maple Avenue Intersection Improvements	859,452	954,255	980,103	7,500,000	1	7	Final Design	N/Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	Y
26	Leesburg	Route 7 (East Market Street)/Battlefield Parkway Interchange	1,000,000	1,000,000	11,000,000	58,000,000	1	7	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
27	Herndon	East Elden Street Improvements & Widening Project (UPC 50100)	2,600,000	2,600,000	5,200,000	22,458,000	1	606/6656	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
28	Prince William	Route 1 Widening from Featherstone Road to Marys Way	5,000,000	15,000,000	29,400,000	52,400,000	8	1	PE	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
29	Prince William	Route 15 Widening (Route 29 to Route 55), including RR Overpass	11,400,000	31,000,000	53,630,000	96,030,000	2	15	PE	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
30	Fairfax	VA Route 28 Widening (Prince William County Line to Route 29)	0	3,550,000	3,550,000	47,350,000	3	28	Study	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	Y
31 (G)	Manassas	Route 28 Widening South to the City Limits	0	3,294,000	0	11,001,000	3	28	ROW	Y/Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
32	Manassas	Route 28 (Manassas Bypass) Study - Godwin Drive Extension	500,000	0	0	500,000	3	1	PE	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
33 (G)	Prince William	Route 28 Widening from Route 234 Bypass to Linton Hall Road	3,800,000	5,000,000	7,900,000	16,700,000	3	28	PE	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
<b>Subtotal Funding</b>			<b>25,394,452</b>	<b>168,023,255</b>	<b>230,035,103</b>	<b>1,715,636,000</b>									
<b>Total FY 14 - FY 16 Funding Requested</b>			<b>\$423,452,810</b>												

NOTE: Under column "Item" - Value "G" represents a packaged project.

**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA)**

**Projects Submitted for Consideration for FY 2014 - FY2016 Funding (02/12/13 V.3)**

MASS TRANSIT PROJECTS THAT INCREASE CAPACITY										Tier I Screen					
Item	Agency	Project Description	FY14 Funding Required	FY15 Funding Required	FY16 Funding Required	Total Project Cost	Corridor	Route	Status	CLRP/TIP	TA2040	Reduces Congestio	Increases Capacity - transit only	Within/adj. to NVTA Boundary	Meets All Requirements (Y/N)
1	Alexandria	Potomac Yard Metrorail Station	0	500,000	1,000,000	287,484,000	8	1	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	Alexandria	Van Dorn - Beaugard Transitway	0	0	2,400,000	129,000,000	8		Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3	City of Fairfax	CUE 35-foot Bus Acquisition	0	3,000,000	0	3,000,000			N/A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	Fairfax	Richmond Highway Transit Center	0	0	24,000,000	24,000,000	8	1	FY 15 PE Sta	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
5	Fairfax	West Ox Bus Garage	0	10,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000			Design	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	Fairfax	Connector Bus Service Expansion – Capital Purchase 22 Buses	0	5,500,000	5,500,000	11,000,000	N/A		N/A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7	Fairfax	Innovation Center Metrorail Station Construction	0	24,000,000	24,000,000	89,000,000	1	267	Design	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8	Loudoun	Acquisition of 4 Buses	0	1,860,000	0	1,860,000			N/A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	PRTC	Western Bus Maintenance and Storage Facility	0	8,000,000	8,000,000	26,000,000	6	66	Design	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10	WMATA	New Buses (10) and Bus Infrastructure Improvements	0	12,400,000	12,400,000	66,400,000	Multiple	N/A	N/A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11	WMATA	8-Car Train Traction Power Upgrades Located in Virginia	0	27,355,000	17,061,000	424,811,000	Multiple	N/A	Contract Aw	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12	Alexandria	Duke Street Transit Signal Priority	190,000	0	0	250,000	7	N/A	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13	VRE	Franconia-Springfield to Woodbridge 3rd Track	450,000	2,435,000	47,115,000	50,000,000	8	N/A	Study	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
14	VRE	Manassas Park Station Parking Expansion	500,000	2,000,000	16,500,000	19,000,000	6	N/A	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15	VRE	Slaters Lane Crossover	600,000	6,400,000	0	7,000,000	8	N/A	Study	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
16	VRE	Franconia-Springfield Platform Expansion	775,000	4,225,000	0	5,000,000	8	N/A	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
17	VRE	Crystal City Platform Extension Study	2,000,000	0	0	2,000,000	8	1	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
18	VRE	Rippon Station Expansion and Second Platform	5,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	14,633,000	8	N/A	Study	Y/Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
19	Arlington	Ballston Metrorail Station West Entrance	5,100,000	10,800,000	40,100,000	56,000,000	8	N/A	Design	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Subtotal Funding</b>			<b>14,615,000</b>	<b>120,975,000</b>	<b>210,576,000</b>	<b>1,236,438,000</b>									
<b>Total Transit Funding Requested FY 14 - FY 16</b>			<b>\$346,166,000</b>												

NOTE: Under column "Item" - Value "N/A" represents projects that are not recommended for submission to VDOT Evaluation and Rating Study

## Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**DRAFT** Schedule for the FY15-16 Program

<b>July 24, 2014</b>	<b>Report to the Authority on basic results of HB599 Interim Rating Study (VDOT)</b>  <i>NVTA adopts schedule for NVTA FY15-16 Program</i>
<i>August 2014</i>	<i>PIWG develops draft project selection criteria for NVTA FY15-16 Program</i>
<i>September 2014</i>	<i>Coordination with JACC, TAC, PCAC on project selection criteria</i>
<i>October 2014</i>	<i>NVTA approves NVTA project selection criteria</i>
<b>November 2014</b>	<b>VDOT releases draft Detailed HB 599 Rating Report</b>
<i>November/December 2014</i>	<i>NVTA Staff/PIWG develop “Strawman” Draft NVTA FY15-16 Program through approved project selection criteria and results of draft Detailed Rating Report</i>
<b>December 11, 2014</b>	<b>NVTA to receive briefing on VDOT draft Detailed Rating Report</b>
<b>December 31, 2014</b>	<b>VDOT releases Final HB 599 Rating Report</b>
<i>December 2014/Jan. 2015</i>	<i>Coordination with JACC, TAC, PCAC on Draft FY15-16 Program</i>
<b>January 2015</b>	<b>NVTA to receive briefing on VDOT Final HB599 Rating Report</b>
<i>January 2015</i>	<i>NVTA approves Draft NVTA FY15-16 Program for Public Hearing</i>
<i>February 2015</i>	<i>Hold Public Hearings on Draft NVTA FY15-16 Program</i>
<i>March 2015</i>	<i>NVTA approves FY15-16 Program</i>

<b>Preliminary FY2015/16 Regional Revenue Fund Summary Sources and Uses</b>
---

<b>FY2015/FY2016 Revenue Sources</b>
--------------------------------------

<b>Regional Revenue Funds (70%)</b>	410,078,599
<b>Carry Forward 'FY2014' Funds</b>	76,431,787
<b>Fund Balance</b>	<u>486,510,386</u>

<b>FY2015/2016 Uses Other Than Projects</b>
---

<b>WCR Initial Funding (18 Months)</b>	101,582,208
<b>WCR Incremental Chg</b>	1,874,888
<b>Series 2014 Bond Principal</b>	4,000,000
<b>Series 2014 Bond Interest</b>	5,300,000
<b>Non Project Uses</b>	<u>112,757,096</u>
 <b>Available Balance Regional Funds</b>	 373,753,290

18-Aug-14

## Attachment E: Draft Project Selection Criteria

### Screening Tier I: Pass/Fail Assessment

Screening Criteria	Assigned Value
<b>All projects</b>	
Contained in the regional transportation plan (TransAction 2040/CLRP/TIP)	"Y/N" given for each category
Reduces congestion	"Y/N"
Within locality embraced by the Authority or in adjacent localities but only to the extent that such extension is an insubstantial part of the project and is essential to the viability of the project within the localities embraced by the Authority.	"Y/N" if project or service is contained within the geographic boundaries of the NVTA
<b>Highway projects only</b>	
Rated in the HB599 Project Evaluation and Rating Study (does not apply to projects funded using NVTA FY2014 regional funds.) project selection criteria will be applied to the final ratings, which will be available by December 31, 2014 (with draft final ratings in November 2014.)	"Y/N"
<b>Mass Transit projects only</b>	
Mass Transit project that increases capacity.	"Y/N"

DRAFT



Screening Tier II: Calculation of Composite Scores

TransAction 2040 Goal: Provide responsive transportation service to customers			
Topic	Selection Criteria	Rating Scale (unless indicated otherwise, High = 1, Medium = 2/3, Low = 1/3)	Weighting (75 points)
Reduce Roadway Congestion (Highway projects)	Project reduces roadway congestion	HB599 detailed rating will be on a continuous scale of 0 (least congestion relief) to 100 (greatest congestion relief) <b>Rating:</b> HB599 detailed rating ÷ 100	35
Reduce Roadway Congestion (Transit projects)	Project reduces roadway congestion	<b>High:</b> Project will significantly improve traffic flow. <b>Medium:</b> Project will moderately improve traffic flow. <b>Low:</b> Project will have minimal to no effect on traffic flow.	
Project Readiness	Project is in advanced phase of development	<b>High:</b> Project is in the ROW or construction phase. <b>Medium:</b> Project is in the design phase. <b>Low:</b> Project is in the study or planning phase.	15
	Project is able to be readily implemented <sup>1</sup>	<b>High:</b> Project can be implemented in the near term (<6 years). <b>Medium:</b> Project can be implemented in the short term (6-12 years). <b>Low:</b> Project can be implemented in the long term (>12 years).	10
Urgency	Project addresses existing significant level of service (LOS) deficiencies for all modes of transportation	<b>High:</b> Project addresses existing LOS F condition. <b>Medium:</b> Project addresses existing LOS E condition. <b>Low:</b> Project addresses existing LOS A, B, C, or D condition.	5
Reduce VMT	Project reduces vehicle-miles traveled	<b>High:</b> Project directly reduces VMT (i.e., transit project, park-and-ride lot, new HOV lane(s), new pedestrian and bicycle trail). <b>Medium:</b> Project indirectly or through expansion reduces VMT (i.e., expansion of HOV, transit improvement, or expansion). <b>Low:</b> Project does not reduce VMT.	5
Safety	Project improves the safety of the transportation system	<b>High:</b> Project designed to specifically improve system safety and/or address an existing safety deficiency. <b>Medium:</b> Project will generally result in a safety improvement. <b>Low:</b> Project will have no discernible positive effect on safety.	5

<sup>1</sup> As indicated by percent environmental clearance complete; percent preliminary engineering complete; or other factors (e.g., right-of-way acquired)

<b>TransAction 2040 Goal: Maximize community connectivity by addressing transportation and land use together</b>			
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Rating Scale (High = 1, Medium = 2/3, Low = 1/3)</b>	<b>Weighting (10 points)</b>
Activity Center Connections	Project improves connections between multiple Activity Centers	<b>High:</b> Project improves connectivity between three or more activity centers. <b>Medium:</b> Project improves connectivity between two activity centers. <b>Low:</b> Project improves connectivity to one activity center only.	5
Land Use Supports Transportation Investment	Project is supported by a Comprehensive plan	<b>High:</b> Project is identified in an approved Comprehensive Plan. <b>Medium:</b> Project is being considered for inclusion in a Comprehensive Plan. <b>Low:</b> Project is not identified in a Comprehensive Plan.	5

<b>TransAction 2040 Goal: Provide an integrated, multimodal transportation system</b>			
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Rating Scale (High = 1, Medium = 2/3, Low = 1/3)</b>	<b>Weighting (5 points)</b>
Improved Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel Options	Project supports multiple use development patterns in a walkable environment	<b>High:</b> Project adds or extends non-motorized facility to and within activity center. <b>Medium:</b> Project improves existing non-motorized facility to and within activity center. <b>Low:</b> Project does not improve or provide a non-motorized facility to and within activity center.	5

<b>TransAction 2040 Goal: Incorporate the benefits of technology</b>			
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Rating Scale (High = 1, Medium = 2/3, Low = 1/3)</b>	<b>Weighting (5 points)</b>
Management and Operations	Project improves the management and operation of existing facilities through technology applications	<b>High:</b> Project improves technological management and operations of an existing transportation facility. <b>Medium:</b> Project improves technological management and operations of an expansion of an existing transportation facility. <b>Low:</b> No improvement to management and operations of a facility.	5

<b>TransAction 2040 Goal: Identify funding and legislative initiatives needed to implement the Plan</b>			
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Rating Scale (High = 1, Medium = 2/3, Low = 1/3)</b>	<b>Weighting (5 points)</b>
Cost Sharing	Project leverages private or other outside funding	<b>High:</b> Project leverages private or other outside funding. <b>Medium:</b> Project leverages modest private or other outside funding. <b>Low:</b> Project has no leveraged private or other outside funding.	5

### Screening Tier III: Qualitative Considerations

Screening Criteria
Priority given to greatest congestion reduction relative to cost – the Authority is required to give priority to such projects. Benefit/cost analysis included in the TransAction 2040 long range transportation plan will be reviewed.
Continuity of project funding
Project funding requests versus revenues
Cost sharing
Geographic balance
Additional supporting information

DRAFT